

Regional Transportation Plan 2001

Public Outreach & Involvement Program

Phase I Summary Report

Prepared by
The MIG Team
Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc.
Elmwood Consulting
Synapse Strategies



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. MAJOR MESSAGES FROM RTP STAKEHOLDERS	5
Message 1: Let Us Get More Out of Our Existing Transportation Resources	5
Message 2: We Are Having Tremendous Problems Moving People and Freight	6
Message 3: We Will Take Transit More If Key Obstacles Are Removed.....	9
Message 4: Transit Is Vital to Low-Income Individuals, But It Takes Too Long	10
Message 5: Land Use and Transportation Cannot Be Separated.....	12
Message 6: We Do Not Understand Who Is In Charge	14
3. WORKSHOP AND WEB RESULTS	17
Identifying Key Transportation Challenges	18
Supporting New Funding Sources	21
Making Investment Choices for New Funding	23
Managing Pollution and Energy Consumption	27
Accommodating Growth.....	29
Building a Lifeline Transit System.....	32
Improving Access for Freight and Airport/Seaports	35
Exploring Values.....	38
4. COMPARISON OF WORKSHOPS/WEB SURVEY AND TELEPHONE POLL	39
5. METHODOLOGY	45
6. NEXT STEPS	53

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission wishes to acknowledge the individuals, organizations and agencies listed below for devoting their time and resources to making the Phase I RTP Public Outreach Program a success.

AGENCIES & ORGANIZATIONS

Bay View Hunters Point Community Advocates
California Alliance for Jobs
California State Automobile Association
Chinatown Community Development Center
Chinatown Transportation Research and Improvement Project
City of San Rafael
Continental of Omega Boys and Girls Club
Contra Costa Labor and Environmental Movements Collaboration
Contra Costa County Social Services Agency
East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation
Economic Development Alliance for Business
Federation of Latin American Descendants
Filipino-American Social Services
League of Women Voters, San Jose/Santa Clara Chapter
MTC's Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee
Neighborhood House of North Richmond
North Coast Builders Exchange
One East Palo Alto Neighborhood Initiative
Port of Oakland
Santa Clara County Social Services Agency
Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group
United Neighborhoods Association of Santa Clara County
Vallejo Intertribal Council

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY WORKSHOP CO-SPONSORS

Alameda County Congestion Management Agency
Contra Costa Transportation Authority & West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee
San Mateo County Congestion Management Agency
Solano County Congestion Management Agency
Sonoma County Transportation Authority

A C K N O W L E D G M E N T S

MTC PUBLIC OUTREACH AND INVOLVEMENT TEAM

Steve Heminger
Therese McMillan
Ann Flemer
Randy Rentschler
Marjorie Blackwell
Ellen Griffin
Catalina Alvarado
Rèka Goode
Joe Curley
Brenda Kahn
Pam Grove
Maria Higuera
John Goodwin
David Cooper
Ethan Michaels
Michelle Stone

MTC PLANNING TEAM

Chris Brittle
Doug Kimsey
Ashley Nguyen
Lisa Kline
Trent Lethco
Valerie Knepper
Susan Williams
Marc Roddin
Vince Petrites

RTP PUBLIC OUTREACH CONSULTING TEAM

Carolyn Verheyen, Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc.
Julie Kirschbaum, Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc.
Bruce Riordan, Elmwood Consulting
Lysa Hale, Synapse Strategies
Adrienne Jacoby, Synapse Strategies
Claudia Miller, Synapse Strategies

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The *Regional Transportation Plan* (RTP) is the principal long-range planning document of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The 2001 RTP is a comprehensive, multi-billion-dollar plan that specifies the investments and strategies necessary for the maintenance, management and improvement of the Bay Area transportation network for the years 2001-2026. That network includes transit, highway, airport, seaport, railroad, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

From late February to mid-May, MTC solicited public participation on the 2001 RTP development during Phase I of the RTP Public Outreach and Involvement Program. This input is helping to provide direction on regional priorities for the RTP's policy element, influence the list of funded projects that are included in the plan and define a set of alternative transportation funding approaches for the region. The program's findings will also help to identify issues that require more study and research and to influence other MTC actions outside the RTP process.

MTC will release a draft RTP and an accompanying draft environmental impact report (EIR) in August 2001. Phase II of the MTC's RTP Public Outreach and Involvement Program will follow with adoption of the final *Regional Transportation Plan* in November, 2001.

MTC EMBARKS ON PUBLIC OUTREACH AND INVOLVEMENT

Prior to its initiation, eight broad goals were established for the RTP Outreach and Involvement Program covering quality of participation, diversity, education, reach, accessibility, impact and participant satisfaction. Performance measures were adopted for each of these goals.

Phase I was designed to explore why citizens are drawn to support specific projects and to allow participants to both discuss their transportation values, needs and priorities, *and* debate the merits of specific projects to be included in the RTP.

Phase I began with a large kick-off workshop for the public on February 27, followed by a series of 28 targeted workshops in April and May, a Web-based survey modeled after the workshops and a regional telephone survey. A media relations campaign was mounted to encourage attendance and participation in Phase I activities, as well as to educate the public about the RTP.

The two-hour workshops combined a "walkaround" open house — to educate participants and give them the chance to vote on a range of transportation issues — with small- and large-group discussions. Many of the workshops were targeted at specific communities and interests, such as

business groups, low-income communities and seniors. The workshops sought to involve individuals and organizations that have previously not participated in the RTP planning process.

More than 4,000 members of the public participated in Phase I of the Public Outreach and Involvement Program, representing a diverse cross-section of the nine-county Bay Area.

RTP STAKEHOLDERS SEND MAJOR MESSAGES

Six major messages emerged from the workshops and the Web survey that were voiced by virtually all groups in the outreach process.

Message 1: Let us get more out of our existing transportation resources.

After investing billions of dollars in roads and transit in the Bay Area, we should maximize the return on this significant investment through better management, improved maintenance and more efficient operation of the existing system. Specific suggestions included filling underutilized carpool/bus lanes, using signal timing and other technologies to relieve congested streets, improving the performance of *existing* buses and trains, and filling gaps in the current bike-lane system.

Message 2: We are having tremendous problems moving people and freight — caused by both traffic congestion and inadequate transit service—and we are worried because things are getting worse, not better.

Individuals voiced a real sense of urgency about the serious impacts on their lives, their businesses and the Bay Area's quality of life from traffic congestion, inadequate transit services and other transportation problems. A major finding from many of the workshops was that our Bay Area transportation problems appear to be getting worse, not better. Responding to this crisis, workshop participants supported new transportation funding mechanisms. They proposed that transportation planners use trial programs and pilot projects to test new and unique approaches. They also made a plea for stronger leadership from MTC and other transportation agencies to provide the vision and direction that the region desperately needs.

Message 3: We will take transit more if some of the key obstacles are removed.

A number of workshop participants indicated that they would take transit more often if transportation agencies removed some of the key barriers that discourage transit use, such as inadequate local transit connections to rail stations, too many different tickets and passes, and personal safety concerns. Specific suggestions included transit agencies working together to improve intersystem transfers, a single ticket fare card, a series of safety improvements, improved

bus and shuttle connections to rail stations and trial programs for free transit service in specific areas.

Message 4: Transit is vital to low-income individuals, but it takes too long.

For individuals who depend on transit and paratransit to get to work, school and medical services, transit is not a choice; rather it is an essential part of their daily lives. The number one transit issue for those who depend on transit was that trips on transit take too long, sometimes taking 5 to 10 times longer than driving. Participants also spotlighted infrequent service, lack of evening and weekend services, the high cost of transit and buses and trains to areas that are not currently served. Specific suggestions included faster bus service by expanding bus-only lanes on streets and freeways, expanding trains and light rail, providing more direct services to major destinations such as large medical centers, providing longer hours for transit at night and during the weekend, and subsidizing transit fares for low-income individuals.

Message 5: Land use and transportation cannot be separated.

Workshop and Web survey participants emphatically stated that land use and transportation cannot be separated. Transportation services must be coordinated with land-use planning if we are to avoid increased congestion, decreased mobility and a poorer quality of life. Transportation agencies cannot, by themselves, fix our transportation problems. Addressing the Bay Area's housing crisis is central to solving our long-term transportation problems. Specific suggestions included: building more affordable housing in the central Bay Area; developing much stronger partnerships between government agencies responsible for land-use and transportation planning; building or rebuilding communities around transit, walking, and biking; and providing incentives to cities and housing developers to increase the supply of housing near transit services.

Message 6: We do not understand who is in charge.

The complicated transportation decision-making process often confused and sometimes angered workshop participants. In most cases, they were not familiar with the agencies that were listed. Hearing how many entities were involved made it difficult for many to understand who is in charge of improving the transportation system, who makes the decisions, and whom local citizens should be persuading or pressuring. The frustration was heightened by a perception that agencies tend toward "passing the buck." Specific suggestions included consolidating planning agencies and plans, consolidating transit service providers, defining clearer authority for each transportation agency, and pushing decision-making down to the lowest level possible within an organization. Participants also requested more regional leadership from MTC.

WORKSHOP AND WEB USERS VOICE THEIR VIEWS

Satisfaction with Transportation

People were generally dissatisfied with the Bay Area transportation system for work trips, medical trips, school and after-school trips, child-care trips, and recreation trips, with fewer than 20 percent of participants saying that they had a high level of satisfaction for any of these trips.

Key Mobility Challenges

Key mobility challenges identified, in order of importance, were:

- Too much congestion on freeways
- Too much congestion on local streets and roads
- Transit takes too long
- Transit does not go where I need to go
- Too hard/dangerous to get around on a bike
- Transit does not run when I need to travel

Support for New Funding

Participants supported new funding mechanisms including:

- New half-cent sales tax
- 10-cent per gallon regional gas tax
- Additional \$1 bridge toll
- Higher vehicle registration fees
- New state transportation bonds

Participants opposed higher transit fares and new property taxes.

Investment Choices

When presented with limited “forced” choices, participants tended to favor maintenance/operation of transit and roads over expansion, transit improvements over road improvements and improvements that benefit work trips as opposed to non-work trips.

Participants' top choices for allocating new funding, in order of preference, were:

- Expand train services/add trains
- Expand bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- Maintain and replace street and highway pavement
- Expand express and local buses
- Provide more transit service to low-income neighborhoods

Environmental Protection

To ensure environmental protection, participants supported several measures:

- New housing and office developments that promote and enhance transit use
- Expanded public transit
- An accelerated shift to low-emission vehicles
- More bicycle/pedestrian facilities
- More financial and other incentives to take transit

Accommodating Growth

Participants expressed strong support for:

- Incentives that promote mixed-income housing and other compact development near transit lines
- Revitalizing and building new housing in central Bay Area cities and older suburbs
- Building new housing and other development along existing transit lines in central cities and older suburbs and along new transit lines in new suburbs

Lifeline Transit Services

Participants defined the most vital lifeline services as improved transit services to work, improved transit services to school and lower transit fares for low-income individuals.

Most participants wanted to fund lifeline transit operations by increasing overall efficiency of transit services, and many supported shifting money from streets and roads to transit. Some supported shifting funds from transit capital projects to transit operations.

Freight and Airport/Seaport Access

Improving ground transportation to seaport/airport facilities and improving mobility for trucking received strong support from participants.

RTP Goals/Values

When participants were asked to rank the top-level goals of the RTP, equity, environmental protection, the livability and viability of neighborhoods and districts, a healthy economy and efficient movement of goods and people were all scored somewhat equally.

SOME TELEPHONE POLL RESULTS ECHO WORKSHOP AND WEB RESULTS

In addition to the workshops and Web survey, MTC conducted a separate regional telephone poll of registered voters that probed some of the same transportation issues. An analysis of the three methods shows several key areas of agreement.

All three methods (telephone poll, workshops, Web survey) found:

- Widespread dissatisfaction with the Bay Area's transportation system.
- Three top challenges: Traffic congestion is the number one issue overall; there are a number of serious problems with public transit; and traffic makes biking and walking unsafe.
- Significant support for expanding rail services, maintaining streets and roads, expanding bus services and implementing a single ticket fare card.
- A desire for building housing along BART and transit lines, and building new housing and transportation in developed areas (central cities/older suburbs).
- The need to shift truck cargo to rail or ferry, dedicate lanes for trucks on freeways and encourage more night deliveries instead of day goods movement.
- Fear about bike safety issues from traffic that poses a significant obstacle to increased use of bicycles.
- Majority support for a half-cent sales tax, higher vehicle registrations and new state transportation bonds and overwhelming opposition to raising transit fares to fund new transportation improvements.
- Majority support for shifting some funding from roads to lifeline transit operations, shifting some funding from transit capital expenditures to lifeline transit operations, plus overwhelming opposition to reducing commute transit services to fund more non-commute period transit.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is the long-range transportation plan for the nine-county Bay Area. The RTP describes the programs and projects necessary to maintain, manage and improve the region's transportation network — transit (buses, trains, ferries, paratransit), local roads, freeways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, carpooling, airports and seaports. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) — which functions as the regional transportation planning agency and, for federal purposes, the metropolitan planning organization — updates the plan every three years. The 2001 RTP will cover a 25-year period, from 2001-2026.

The cost of all projects in the RTP cannot be more than what the Bay Area expects to receive in the next 25 years from all federal, state and local transportation funding sources. For 2001-2026, the Bay Area expects to have about \$81 billion to spend on transportation. Of this amount, \$74 billion is already committed for continuing to operate, maintain and manage our *existing* transportation network over the next 25 years, as well as fund new transportation projects that MTC, the counties and (in some cases) voters have already agreed to design and implement. This leaves about \$7 billion in “uncommitted” funding in the 2001 RTP. One of the primary functions of the 2001 RTP is to specify how MTC will spend this \$7 billion to meet the long-term transportation needs of the region.

Eighty-one billion dollars over the next 25 years is not, however, enough to expand the Bay Area's transportation services to meet the needs of a fast-growing population and economy. Thus the 2001 RTP also will include a set of new programs and projects that *could* be developed if the Bay Area obtains additional funding from increased gas taxes, sales taxes, user fees or other sources. This list of “unfunded” new projects and programs will help MTC and the counties to lay out a compelling case to federal and state officials and to voters for the Bay Area's need for additional transportation funding.

The RTP consists of three sections. The Policy Element will reflect the mobility goals, policies and objectives of the region. The Action Element will identify programs and actions to implement the RTP. The Financial Element will summarize the cost of implementing the projects in the RTP considering a financially constrained environment.

The RTP is accompanied by an environmental impact report (EIR), as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970. The EIR will contain analysis of the potential environmental effects of the adoption of the 2001 RTP Proposed Project and recommend a set of measures to mitigate any significant adverse regional impacts. It will also analyze several project alternatives.

RTP PUBLIC OUTREACH PRINCIPLES AND GOALS

Approaching the 2001 RTP, MTC was in a unique position to generate valuable discussion about how the Bay Area should invest in its transportation system over the next 25 years. Such discussion must, however, get at the tough choices to be made in the RTP. So while other outreach programs may ask participants to check off which projects they like or dislike, MTC embarked on an ambitious Public Outreach and Involvement Program that would explore more deeply why citizens are drawn to support specific projects and, in fact, force outreach program participants to ask this question of themselves. The program was designed to allow participants to both discuss their transportation values, needs and priorities, *and* debate the merits of specific projects to be included within the RTP.

The following principles were developed to guide implementation of the Public Outreach and Involvement Program:

- ***Flexibility:*** This outreach and involvement process needs to accommodate the many ways in which people can and want to participate – in person, via phone, Internet, etc.
- ***Consistency and Fairness:*** Although input and involvement will be generated through a variety of methods and with a range of participants, the collection of feedback should be done as consistently as possible.
- ***Inclusivity:*** No one should be excluded from participating in the public outreach and involvement program, and MTC should strive to include as diverse a group of participants as possible.
- ***Influence:*** The process needs to identify and communicate clearly where the public can have real, significant influence upon decision-making.

In keeping with the recently completed review of MTC public involvement procedures that called for setting measurable goals with respect to public outreach and involvement, MTC worked with its consultant team to establish broad goals:

- ***“High-quality” Input and Participation:*** This means receiving comments that are useful and generating discussion that adds value to the process and builds consensus at the same time.
- ***Diversity:*** Participants must represent a range of socioeconomic, ethnic and cultural, geographic and user (mode) groups. They must also include a range of people with varying interests: social service; business; environment; social justice/equity; etc.
- ***Education:*** This outreach program is an opportunity for MTC to educate a wide range of people about transportation issues in the Bay Area. Each step of the process should include an educational element, whether it is about Bay Area transportation in general, specific projects being considered for inclusion in the RTP or background on the outreach results to date.
- ***Reach:*** The program should make every effort to include the greatest number of people possible. Different levels of participation will make it more inviting for people with a range of involvement preferences to join the discussion.

- **Accessibility:** Every effort should be made to ensure that anyone who wants to participate can. This goal can be met by, whenever possible, taking the participation activities to where people already are located. It can also be met by providing alternative ways to participate, regardless of individuals' language or ability to attend a meeting, use the Web or participate in another pre-established way.
- **Impact:** The feedback received through this Outreach Program should be analyzed and incorporated wherever appropriate and decisions to not incorporate comments should be noted.
- **Participant Satisfaction:** People who take the time and energy to participate should feel it was worth their while to join in the discussion and debate.

A complete description of the performance objectives and measures associated with each of these goals is included in Chapter 5.

PUBLIC OUTREACH AND INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

The program was designed in two phases. The first phase — with a combined focus on values, priorities and projects — included four types of activities.

A series of workshops utilized a “walkaround” session, where large displays provided education about a range of issues affecting the RTP, as well as an opportunity to respond to various questions related to each RTP topic and to provide written comments. The walkaround was followed by a group discussion of the key issues. Some workshops included a “trio” exercise, in which participants worked in groups of three to reach consensus about values they wanted to be reflected in the RTP. Many of the workshops targeted specific communities, while others were open to all members of public. A total of 29 workshops were held, with more than 700 attendees. Translation in Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese and Lao was made available, and assistance for participants with disabilities was provided at some workshops. A complete listing of the workshops including sponsors, dates and locations is included in Chapter 5: Methodology.

For those with access to the Internet, MTC staff created a “virtual tour” of the RTP modeled after the workshop walkaround. The questions were similar, and participants could vote as well as provide comments. More than 1,700 people participated, and more than 2,200 comments were received. Votes were recorded automatically.

To support the workshops and Web survey, MTC and the consultant team distributed news releases and flyers announcing local workshops, contacted TV and radio stations for talk-show bookings and distributed a video of the kick-off event to cable stations and systems. Activities targeting minority/low-income communities were focused on generating attendance at the workshops and included distributing flyers in multiple languages to community-based organizations, churches, and municipal or neighborhood communications media.

To provide a regional overview of public opinion on key RTP issues, MTC staff designed and conducted a telephone poll of 1,600 registered voters in April and May. (The results of the poll are included in Appendix C.)

Public input provided during Phase I will directly influence the RTP in five ways. The input will:

- Provide direction on regional priorities for the RTP's policy element
- Influence project selection for the RTP's list of funded projects
- Help define the EIR alternatives
- Identify issues that require more study and research
- Influence other MTC actions outside the RTP process

Phase II will take place after the draft plan has been developed. The Draft RTP and EIR will be released in mid-August 2001, and another round of public involvement will take place in September and October. A final RTP and EIR will be adopted by the Commission in November 2001.

REPORT OVERVIEW

Chapter 2 provides a summary of the major common messages heard from the public as they participated in the outreach process. Summaries of the findings — including results of the workshop and Web voting as well as comments provided — are provided in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 provides an analysis that compares the results of the telephone poll with the results of the workshops and Web voting. Chapter 5 provides a detailed description of the methodology and activities employed in Phase I. Chapter 6 outlines the next steps for the Public Outreach and Involvement Program.

Detailed findings are included in the appendices of this report; they include:

- Appendix A: Workshop Walkaround Station Displays
- Appendix B: Workshop Walkaround "Dot Voting" Results
- Appendix C: Telephone Poll Results
- Appendix D: Summary of Workshop Comments
- Appendix E: Summary of Web Survey Results and Comments

2. MAJOR MESSAGES FROM RTP STAKEHOLDERS

Six major messages emerged from the workshops and the Web survey. These messages were voiced by virtually all groups in the outreach process through the voting exercises and written/verbal comments. They illustrate the common ground among diverse stakeholders.

MESSAGE 1:

Let us get more out of our *existing* transportation resources.

Participants voiced a strong belief that, after investing billions of dollars in roads and transit in the Bay Area, we should maximize the return on this significant investment through better management, improved maintenance and more efficient operation of the existing system. Stakeholders indicated that we are not fully and effectively utilizing a number of our transportation resources, including empty buses, half-full carpool lanes, roadways overly congested with single-occupant vehicles and bicycle lanes that are underused because they are not continuous. In addition, individuals proposed that we look more closely at ways to increase the carrying capacity of our current transit and roadway systems. Participants argued that additional investments (some in relatively small and inexpensive projects) should be made to ensure that all parts of our transportation system work more efficiently and effectively.

This message was seen clearly when participants were asked how they would spend any new funding. The number three overall answer (out of 18 strategies presented) was *maintain and replace street and highway pavement*. *Maintain transit vehicles/facilities* was ranked seventh overall. When participants were asked the best ways to fund “lifeline” transit services, more than 90 percent supported efforts to *improve overall transit efficiency to free up transit operating funds for lifeline services*.

Specific suggestions from workshop and Web survey participants:

Participants voiced a series of suggestions to make the existing system work more efficiently. Examples included:

- Fill underutilized carpool/bus lanes by providing carpool incentives, increasing express bus services, promoting ridematching services and standardizing lane hours and rules.
- Make traffic on local streets and roads flow smoother by expanding signal timing and other technological strategies, fixing potholes and redesigning inefficient, and unsafe intersections.
- Improve the performance of existing buses and trains by facilitating more efficient transfers across agency boundaries, making more buses run on time, filling empty seats through

incentives or promotions, improving driver courtesy and customer assistance, and making it easier to get route and schedule information.

- Turn underutilized bicycle lanes into a much more attractive and functional bicycle network by filling gaps within the current system.

Voices from the Workshops and the Web

- *There are too many traffic lights on local streets that are not timed. This causes serious congestion.*
- *Why can't the multi-passenger lanes be contiguous? I can't comprehend why in the world this is not coordinated on a regional basis.*
- *Many vital road links are missing. For example Highway 237 stops at El Camino Real when it should extend to I-280.*
- *Regional transit system is disjointed, schedules are not well-coordinated and information is not centralized. So for commuters without cars who want to travel across a multi-county area, a huge amount of planning is involved.*
- *Buses on some streets run 3 and 4 at one time, creating unnecessary congestion and pollution. Transit agencies need efficiency management, not more funding.*
- *The fact that I work in a one-story building in Fremont, with no houses around for miles, is totally crazy. My own firm could probably house all its employees on site if we built "studios" on our rooftop, but we are prohibited from building anything beyond one-story high. This promotes urban sprawl and we have some of the worst traffic in the state now.*

MESSAGE 2:

We are having tremendous problems moving people and freight — caused by both traffic congestion and inadequate transit service—and we are worried because things are getting worse, not better.

Workshop participants voiced a real sense of urgency about the serious impacts upon their lives due to traffic congestion, inadequate transit services and other transportation problems. Transportation is not just an “issue” affecting “the community;” rather it is negatively affecting individuals in highly personal ways by limiting their ability to obtain and hold jobs, forcing working parents to spend hours commuting instead of with their families, and restricting seniors’ access to essential medical services and grocery shopping. At the same time, business

representatives reported severe impacts on their ability to hire and retain employees, to receive and ship goods, and to expand their companies resulting from poor mobility.

Furthermore, a major finding from many of the workshops was that our Bay Area transportation problems appear to be getting worse, not better. Many believe that congestion and restricted mobility are causing the Bay Area's quality of life to deteriorate steadily (some would say rapidly), even as we spend more time and resources trying to improve the transportation system. Related to this strong concern was a call from many individuals, businesses and community groups for MTC and other transportation agencies to take stronger, bolder action to try to reverse this negative trend.

During the dot voting exercise and in the Web survey, participants consistently expressed their frustrations related to mobility. Fifty percent of workshop participants stated that their overall satisfaction with the transportation system for work trips was low, while 32 percent reported medium satisfaction and just 18 percent reported high satisfaction. School and child care trips received even lower satisfaction ratings. This dissatisfaction surfaced at all types of workshops including those targeting business organizations, low-income communities and congestion management agency (CMA) sponsored workshops.

Specific suggestions from workshop and Web survey participants:

A majority of workshop participants voiced their support for a variety of new funding mechanisms — sales taxes, gas taxes, bridge tolls, vehicle registration fees and transportation bonds — especially if voters are told up-front how the money will be used.

A number of participants also proposed that transportation planners try new strategies, even those that may be politically charged, such as congestion pricing. Many suggestions were made for trial programs and pilot projects to test new and unique approaches. There was also support for small-scale projects that might produce results more quickly and be approved with simpler processes.

To implement new programs and projects, individuals, businesses, and community organizations made a plea for stronger leadership from MTC and other transportation agencies. Their message was that they want somebody to acknowledge the urgency of the problem and to make things happen. There was an impassioned demand that those who are charged with running the transportation system provide the vision and direction that the region desperately needs.

Voices from the Workshops and the Web

- *If traffic congestion and poor public transportation options do not improve, our quality of life will deteriorate and the environment we will leave for our children will be unlivable. It is up to government, business and individuals to start thinking of long-term, sustainable solutions and work together to make necessary changes and sacrifices today. If we don't, we will regret it in the future, as things will undoubtedly get worse as the population grows in the Bay Area.*
- *We WILL pay for it, but we must feel like we are paying for an adequate system, not one that is unable to meet the needs. It is the responsibility of those who are in legislative and professional transport positions to come up with a system of interlocking transport — buses that go to ferries, ferries that go to trains, trains that go to airports, and information that can be put on one computer system under one authority that allows each person to access schedules and tickets over the Internet — this is a SYSTEM that we will pay for, an adequate system.*
- *If we can't live where we work, then we have to commute to work. It is not only unhealthy but we are throwing away a great portion of our daily life that could be better spent with our family.*
- *Try new approaches. For example, if a company paid its employees \$3/day for each day that they didn't drive, the company's required parking could be reduced five percent. If they paid \$5, seven percent, and so on. The idea would be to make sure that there is enough parking but not more than what is needed.*
- *I believe that we need to move to a demand-responsive "Super Shuttle" type system that will provide low-cost door-to-door trips as a way to increase ridership in vehicles on existing highways and streets.*
- *The past is fact; the future is fiction. Spend "planning" money to look back at the old 10- and 20-year plans for the then "future" and try to learn lessons from what worked, and mostly, from what failed.*
- *On an experimental basis, operate either the BART or Caltrain for one week during the fall or spring at zero cost and watch the volume of passengers increase.*
- *Work, school, child care, food shopping, medical appointments, etc. are all essential to living, and not being able to get to any one of these is a serious setback for a family.*

MESSAGE 3:**We will take transit more if some of the key obstacles are removed.**

Annual surveys by MTC and RIDES for Bay Area Commuters show that about 15 to 20 percent of Bay Area drivers say it would be possible for them to take transit. A number of workshop participants in this “choice users” category indicated that they would take transit more often if transportation agencies removed some of the key barriers that discourage transit use. Some of their top issues included:

- Poor coordination between transit agencies that sometimes forces individuals transferring between services to endure long waits and pay extra for their trips.
- Inadequate local transit connections from rail stations to job centers, housing, medical centers and other key destinations.
- Too many different tickets and passes required if you travel on more than one transit system.
- Personal safety concerns on transit vehicles and at transit stations. This issue was raised particularly by women and by workers who needed to use transit at night.

Barriers to taking transit also surfaced during the dot exercise when participants were asked about their transportation challenges. *Transit takes too long* ranked third (out of 15 strategies presented), *transit does not go where I need to go* ranked fourth and *transit doesn't run when I need to travel* ranked sixth.

Specific suggestions from workshop and Web survey participants:

Participants provided hundreds of suggestions for making transit more attractive, not only to “choice users” but to all transit patrons. Some of their top requests included:

- More evidence that transit agencies are working together to benefit riders who must transfer from one system to another or fewer separately run agencies.
- A single ticket fare card that could be used on all transit systems. (Explanations of the planned Translink™ pass were greeted with enthusiasm.)
- Safety improvements, including better transit station design, changes in bus stop locations, more security staff on buses and trains, and programs to reduce problems caused by teenagers on buses.
- Improved bus and shuttle connections to rail stations from major employers, hospitals, sports/concert venues and other high-volume destinations.
- Trial programs that would provide free transit service in specific areas to increase ridership on partially filled buses.

Voices from the Workshops and the Web

- *BART is way too expensive — it's much cheaper to drive from San Francisco to the East Bay than to take BART — the incremental cost for two people on BART is over \$13 while driving is \$3 even with the bridge toll.*
- *Bus schedules (even truncated schedules) and route maps are not published at bus stops. First-time users, or people taking a new route, really get put off since they do not necessarily want to carry all the schedules/maps with them.*
- *Poor integration between main transit arteries (Caltrain, light rail) and feeders (shuttles). For example, transit from Mountain View to Cupertino takes about 45 minutes vs. 10 minutes driving.*
- *Public transportation agencies do not coordinate their schedules well. A bus that is scheduled to pull away from a train station at the same time a train arrives — causing a wait for the next bus, often 20 to 30 minutes — is not practical for commuting.*
- *Transit from where I live to where I work is great. I take it to work every day, and wouldn't think of driving. Transit from my house to shopping and recreational destinations exists, but is too slow and cumbersome to be practical — so I drive, adding to the local street traffic!*
- *The Bus schedule does not support a flexible work schedule. It assumes everyone still works exactly 8 hours and pulls an 8-to-5 — that's just not reality with today's careers.*
- *We need paid security at transit stations and parking lots.*

MESSAGE 4:

Transit is vital to low-income individuals, but it takes too long.

There were many strong comments at the workshops from individuals who depend on transit and paratransit to get to work, school and medical services. For this significant population—who cannot drive or do not drive due to income, disability and other factors—transit is not a choice. Rather, it is an essential part of their daily lives. During the “dot voting” exercises, participants in the low-income community workshops rated *transit takes too long* as their second challenge (out of 15 strategies presented), *transit is unreliable* as fourth, *transit doesn't run when it's needed* as fifth and *transit too expensive* as sixth.

During the workshop discussions and through comments from the Web survey, transit dependents raised a number of key issues for improving their “lifeline” transportation system, including:

- More frequent service, particularly in areas outside the San Francisco-Oakland urban core that are increasingly home to lower-income and minority residents.
- More service in the evening and on weekends so people can get to the huge number of entry-level jobs that require night, Saturday and Sunday shifts.
- More affordable transit — a major issue for low-income individuals who must use BART and other train services and families that include school-age children.
- Bus and train service to areas that are not currently served by transit.

Transit takes too long was the top transit issue for those who depend on transit. The workshops produced transit horror stories in every county: 20-minute driving trips to work that take one-and-a-half hours on the bus; trips from home to a community college that require three transfers; two hours to get to a large, nearby medical center; and two-hour trips twice a day to take children to child care and then go onto work. Beyond these stories, hundreds of transit-dependent workshop participants voiced their ongoing problems with transit trips that take a huge chunk out of their lives on a daily basis.

Specific suggestions from workshop and Web survey participants:

Workshop participants made a number of key suggestions for dealing with long transit trip times and other key transit issues. Some of the top proposals were:

- Make buses faster by expanding bus-only lanes on streets and freeways and by providing other preferential treatment for transit vehicles.
- Expand trains and light rail, since these transit vehicles are off the congested roads and therefore are faster.
- Provide more direct services to major destinations, such as large medical centers and schools, via accessible taxis, dial-a-ride, and other more flexible, on-demand and point-to-point transit services.
- Provide longer hours for transit to cover late night and weekend work trips.
- Subsidize transit fares for low-income individuals.

Voices from the Workshops and the Web

- *Public transit systems are not given priority in planning, or in road use. Leaving the path of traffic to pick up passengers, and then having to merge back in takes too long. Santa Cruz just passed a law mandating that cars yield to buses. That could work perhaps throughout the region. Also, more transit-only lanes would ease bus transit times.*

Voices from the Workshops and the Web [continued]

- *Public Transit takes too long when you have to make three connections to get to a destination within the same city!*
- *Long waits in bus-to-train connections and circuitous routes are a problem. Transit needs to run more frequently and 24 hours.*
- *The public-transit "system" is too discontinuous, both physically and in ownership. Transfers between providers are arbitrarily expensive, and often poorly scheduled.*
- *People who live in Petaluma have to go to Santa Rosa to participate in County decisions or attend the almost 50 boards, commissions, councils, and task forces. If you do not have a car it takes over 2 hours by bus.*
- *Demand-responsive shared ride or taxi service is a great way to provide transit in low-density areas. Expand the airport super-shuttle concept to more than just the airport.*
- *Make transit free. By doing that, all transit services will improve because the public will use transit much more and will fight for it to be improved to meet their needs.*

MESSAGE 5:

Land use and transportation cannot be separated

When workshop and Web survey participants were asked “How should we accommodate the 1 million additional people that are going to live in the Bay Area in 20 years?” they answered (in a loud voice) that “land use and transportation cannot be separated.” They recognized that congestion, long transit trips and other mobility issues are not just transportation problems. Instead, these were seen as symptoms of broader Bay Area issues, such as affordable housing, job locations, school quality, social equity and land use.

The Bay Area’s housing crisis, in particular — the inability of many individuals and families to afford quality housing near their jobs — was raised continually by employers, commuters and transit advocates as central to solving our long-term transportation problems. Housing advocates, developers and local government representatives spoke about the need for transportation services to be coordinated with land-use planning if we are to avoid increased congestion and a poorer quality of life. Workshop participants clearly acknowledged that transportation agencies could not, by themselves, fix our transportation problems.

When asked how the Bay Area should accommodate the expected growth, more than 90 percent of workshop and Web survey participants stated that they strongly supported or somewhat supported:

- Providing funding incentives for more mixed-housing and other compact development near transit lines.
- Revitalizing and building more new housing in central Bay Area cities and older suburbs rather than in new suburbs on the edge of the region.
- Building new housing and other development along existing transit lines in central cities and older suburbs, and along new transit lines in new suburbs.

Specific suggestions from workshop and Web survey participants:

A number of strategies were proposed or supported for addressing land use and transportation issues. These included:

- Building more housing in the central Bay Area (and affordable housing in particular).
- Improving cooperation between government agencies responsible for developing land use policies and those who conduct transportation planning.
- Building or re-building communities around transit, walking and biking, not just for work trips but also for travel to schools, shopping and recreation.
- Providing incentives to cities and housing developers to increase the supply of housing near transit services.

In addition, some workshop participants voiced concern that the implementation of new land use patterns to support transit, walking and biking could require considerable public education to obtain local acceptance of strategies such as higher density housing along transit corridors.

Voices from the Workshops and the Web

- *A huge part of our problem is that different kinds of land uses are rigidly segregated and kept far apart from each other. If there was more mixed-use zoning and if more higher density housing was located close to major employment centers, the issue of mobility would be much less pressing.*
- *There's not enough local availability of services (shopping, etc.) in my neighborhood so I am forced to drive more than I would like.*

Voices from the Workshops and the Web [continued]

- *Unfortunately, many land use decisions are made with little or no consideration to the transportation system needed to support it due to shortsightedness, political reasons, etc. Or, if they do, they only focus on a few elements of the system like roadway capacity. As a result, once an area is developed and demand is placed on the system, agencies are left with limited resources to improve the transportation system.*
- *Last time I checked, this is still a capitalist/market economy. We don't dictate the way the housing market grows. The government should take on the "support role;" plan, implement and maintain EFFICIENT transit and transportation systems.*
- *Look at congregation of people throughout the week and not only jobs/housing. Neighborhood schools and recreation accessibility issues are being ignored in the search for jobs/housing/transit solutions.*
- *Implement a transportation property tax based on density and access to mass transit. A high rise next to a rail or BART station pays little, but one that is many miles distant, pays a lot.*
- *We need truly affordable housing in urban areas. More and more people are being forced out of their communities because they can't afford their rent. Fewer middle class people can afford to buy homes anywhere near their workplaces. The main focus should not be how to accommodate suburban commuters — it should be how to reduce the number of them.*
- *Transportation decisions should be planned years ahead of growth.*
- *It will take a change in attitude. Everyone says they favor having jobs close to homes, they favor public transit, etc. But when the time comes to vote, they vote in anti-housing policies that push development further into the Central Valley.*

MESSAGE 6:

We do not understand who is in charge.

At the workshops, participants sometimes asked MTC staff and other transportation experts to explain why a specific problem had not been addressed or what the transportation agencies were planning for their local area. While staff did an excellent job of providing this information, their answers often involved explaining how two, three or even more agencies had to be involved in planning and funding for a single project or program. In addition, staff also had to explain the local and regional structure of transportation planning and operations — congestion management agencies, sales tax authorities, local transit agencies, BART, MTC, Caltrans, paratransit service providers, etc.

The complicated transportation decision-making process often confused and sometimes angered workshop participants. In most cases, they were not familiar with the agencies that were listed. Hearing how many entities were involved made it difficult for many to understand who is in charge of improving the transportation system, who makes the decisions, and whom local citizens should be persuading or pressuring. Individuals had come to the workshops to voice their opinions and to talk with transportation experts but were often left feeling that they were dealing with a multi-level bureaucratic structure that made citizen participation difficult and real change illusive. The frustration was heightened by a perception that agencies tend toward “passing the buck.”

Specific suggestions from workshop and Web survey participants:

There were a number of suggestions for making the transportation decision-making process more understandable and therefore more responsive to citizen input. These suggestions — which came from the private sector, disability advocates and others, included:

- Consolidate planning agencies and develop fewer plans, so citizens can understand where to focus their limited time and resources.
- Consolidate service providers for both transit and paratransit, again so individuals can clearly see where to pressure, persuade and cajole.
- Define clearer authority for each transportation agency, so decisions can be made in a more efficient manner.
- Push decision-making down to the lowest level possible within the organization.
- Have MTC demonstrate more leadership by making decisions and moving the region’s many transportation agencies forward in a progressive manner.

Voices from the Workshops and the Web

- *Bring local governments into the regional decision-making and create incentives for them to work together on regional issues instead of all competing for their individual projects that do nothing to solve the regional transportation problem.*
- *MTC should have a small department which follows changes in all city housing plans in the Bay Area and works to assure local housing planning is coordinated with regional transportation plans. MTC or CMAs should condition some local transit funding on adequate coordination of local housing plans with regional transportation plans.*

Voices from the Workshops and the Web [continued]

- *More regional cooperation is needed to coordinate all modes of public transit. It is SO DUMB to have main depots of ferries, BART, Caltrain, and AC Transit buses located blocks or longer from each other!*
- *Consolidate the more than 50 transit agencies in the Bay Area. This would assist in cross-county trips and having uniform fare cards.*

3. WORKSHOP AND WEB RESULTS

Participants who attended one of the 29 workshops were asked to “vote” on a number of key questions related to the long-term development of the transportation system in the Bay Area. The questions were presented in “stations” that featured display boards with educational information about each topic, and posed one or more questions that participants answered by placing dots to indicate their preferred option. Participants were also encouraged to add written comments. For those unable to attend a workshop in person, the “virtual workshop” on the MTC website presented similar information and questions.

The workshops were not designed to be statistically representative of the Bay Area, but rather to provide valuable input from key targeted groups. Four were targeted specifically for the business community and nine for low-income communities. Ten of the workshops were co-sponsored by local congestion management agencies (CMAs) and attracted a range of participants. Others were planned with organizations such as California State Automobile Association and MTC’s Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee.

Participants were asked about their perceptions of the region’s and their own mobility, types of funding they would support for transportation projects, how they would choose to invest new funds and actions MTC should take to protect the environment. They were also asked about land use, equity and economic issues, such as the movement of freight and access to airports and seaports. Their responses explain broad themes and preferences, and highlight commonalities and differences between the targeted groups. Their responses do not represent scientifically precise results because of the nature of the exercises, the mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods and the varying sizes of the workshops. The voting results by workshop, the total from all the workshops, and the totals from the business, low-income community, CMA sponsored and other workshops are contained in Appendix B.

IDENTIFYING KEY TRANSPORTATION CHALLENGES

Participants were asked two questions to ascertain their satisfaction with the transportation system and the challenges they face as they use that system.

What is your overall satisfaction with the region's transportation system for each of the following: work trips, medical trips, school and after-school trips, child care trips and recreation trips?

Workshop Results

Participants responded by giving the system generally low marks:

- Fewer than 20 percent of participants said that they had a high level of satisfaction for work trips, shopping trips, school and after-school trips, child care trips, medical trips and recreation trips.
- Conversely, at least half of participants said that they had a low level of satisfaction for work trips, school and after-school trips and child care trips.

Differences Among Workshops

Although all groups (business, low-income communities, CMA-sponsored workshops, etc.) responded that they had low-to-medium levels of satisfaction for all types of trips, the business group participants reported lower levels of satisfaction than either the low-income groups or those who attended the CMA workshops.

Web Results

Web respondents varied somewhat from the workshop results, with roughly half indicating that they experienced medium satisfaction for all types of trips, except work trips, where they rated their satisfaction as low. Participant's responses to the above question can be found in Appendix B, Pages B-3 and B-4.

What are your biggest challenges to getting around?
--

Workshop Results

The top responses in order of frequency were:

- There is too much congestion on freeways
- There is too much congestion on local streets and roads
- Transit takes too long
- Transit does not go where I need to go
- It is too hard/dangerous to get around on a bike
- Transit does not run when I need to travel

Differences Among Workshops

There were some differences between the business groups and participants in low-income communities. The business groups ranked *freeway congestion* first with *local congestion* and *transit does not go where I need to go* tied for second. Low-income groups, collectively, put *local congestion* first (particularly East Palo Alto and Chinatown) with *transit takes too long* second and *freeway congestion* third, followed closely by *transit unreliable* and *transit does not run when I need to travel*. People who attended the CMA and other workshops also cast many votes for *it is too hard/dangerous to get around on a bike*, with both subsets ranking this problem third. Participants' responses to the above question can be found in Appendix B, Pages B-5 and B-6.

Web Results

These answers were also the top six answers for Web participants, with the number one answer the same. The order of the remaining five answers was somewhat different, but with all garnering between nine and 15 percent of votes.

Most Frequent Comments Related to Transportation Challenges

- ***Biking and Walking:*** Bicyclists and walkers face significant safety issues with traffic and drivers; the lack of bike lanes in places discourages bike use.
- ***Carpooling:*** Rules for hours of operation and occupancies are too different across the region.
- ***Paratransit:*** There are too many paratransit service providers, creating a fragmented system.

- **Streets and Roads:** Need improvements in specific places, such as the 238 Bypass in Hayward, an alternative to University Ave (from the Dumbarton) in East Palo Alto and Highway 101 in Sonoma County. Not using technology enough to improve traffic flow. Congestion affecting everyone; not just drivers, but transit riders, residents living near crowded roadways, public safety vehicles, etc.
- **Transit:** Safety a big concern—women riding at night, people waiting at bus stops, children needing to ride buses by themselves, last bus doesn't come, etc.; Need much more attention paid to improving transfers between systems and/or more services that eliminate the need to transfer. Not enough parking at BART discouraging people from riding. Need more transit services in specific areas, such as North Richmond, East Palo Alto, East San Jose (light rail)—and in general on nights and weekends.

Voices from the Workshops and the Web

- *At 11 p.m. at night in New York City, a subway still comes every few minutes. In San Francisco, you might have to wait 45 minutes for a 38 Geary at that time, and then when it comes, it will be packed.*
- *Weekend bus service is poor, and I have to work Saturdays and some Sundays.*
- *We should emphasize bicycle-to-transit connections and bicycle parking at transit stations.*
- *Los Angeles has 24-hour a day carpool lanes.*
- *It is very difficult to get kids from school to after-school care when the parents are working.*
- *Paratransit services are way too fragmented. People are passed off from one operator to another. We need to consolidate service regionally, or at least within a county.*
- *If we do not do something about the transportation crisis, gridlock will choke us. However, it is difficult to put in major new infrastructure that is good for the region, but bad for an impacted neighborhood.*
- *Many more people will be reaching an age where they cannot drive cars and need public transit.*
- *Bus services are too infrequent. If you miss a bus, then you are really stuck.*
- *Buses in much of Contra Costa do not run at night and on weekends, so people are having to walk to their destinations from BART.*

SUPPORTING NEW FUNDING SOURCES

While the need is great, MTC will be hard pressed — with existing funding — to both maintain the current transportation system and add to it as workshop participants desired. One potential solution is to look for new sources of funding.

What sources of additional funding for transportation would you support?

Workshop Results

- More than half of the participants said that they strongly support or somewhat support a new half-cent sales tax, a 10-cent per gallon regional gas tax, an additional \$1 bridge toll, higher vehicle registration fees and new state transportation bonds.
- More than half of participants said that they strongly opposed or somewhat opposed new property tax assessments and higher transit fares.

Differences Among Workshops

Overall, participants from the low-income groups were more hesitant to support additional funding than the other participants. Collectively, the low-income groups were strongly opposed or somewhat opposed to all of the suggested funding sources except for a new state transportation bond. These results, however, varied from workshop to workshop. In North Richmond, participants expressed significant support for a new sales tax, bridge toll and state transportation bond. In East Palo Alto, attendees said they would support a new gas tax in addition to the transportation bond. Participants' responses to the above question can be found in Appendix B, Pages B-7 and B-8.

Web Results

In the Web questionnaire, participants' answers were similar to those at the workshops.

Most Frequent Comments Related to New Funding Sources

- **Transit fares:** Do not raise transit fares, but experiment with varying fares, discounts, incentives and other creative approaches
- **Taxes (gas, sales, etc.):** Be very clear about how new tax money will be spent. What will be built? What will be accomplished?
- **New ideas:** Experiment with congestion pricing, parking cashout, varying bridge tolls and other new ideas.
- **Don't raise taxes:** Use existing tax money more efficiently before asking for more.
- **Gas tax:** New gas tax best because people who drive more will pay it.

Voices from the Workshops and the Web

- *Clarify what improvements will be made and how many people will benefit before asking people to pay more for transportation projects.*
- *We should focus on more cost-effective projects, not just on more funding.*
- *Each voter should determine the cost of congestion on their family and budget. A gas tax or bridge toll would be a bargain.*
- *Increased mobility will come from a gas tax increase. Earmark money from the gas tax specifically to local streets and highway projects and HOV lane construction. Spell out a plan, like in Alameda County, where funding is predetermined with a percentage set aside for flexible expenditures.*
- *Levy a surcharge for SUV registration within urban areas explicitly dedicated to transit. Use higher bridge tolls for single driver cars all day with a carpool discount 24/7.*
- *Transportation makes up one component of the quality of life in the Bay Area. If you care about the quality of life in the region, it is imperative that you support funding to make it possible.*

MAKING INVESTMENT CHOICES FOR NEW FUNDING

At the workshops, people were asked about their support for general types of improvements as well as support for specific projects.

In general, how would you propose using any NEW funding that is available?

Workshop Results

Participants were presented with a set of choices that asked them to allocate a percentage of new funds along each of four continua: transit expansion versus maintenance; road expansion versus maintenance; transit maintenance/expansion versus road maintenance/expansion; and improvements for work trips versus non-work trips. Participants could indicate 100 percent of funds going to either end of a continuum, an even 50-50 split, or a 75/25 split in either direction. The results were as follows:

- A plurality (35 percent) opted to split any new funds evenly between transit expansion and maintenance, followed by 29 percent who favored 3/4 of the funding going to expansion. This was generally true among each subgroup, although more business workshop participants favored devoting 3/4 of new funds to transit expansion than the workshop participants overall.
- When it came to spreading money across road maintenance versus expansion, the voting was somewhat evenly split. Thirty percent said they would dedicate 3/4 of new funds to maintaining existing roads, while 25 percent said they would devote all new funds to maintenance. The other 45 percent said to either split new funding 50-50 or to spend the majority of it on road expansion.
- Faced with a choice between funding transit and roads, more people leaned in favor of transit, with 34 percent saying they would devote all new funds to transit, and another 29 percent saying they would devote 3/4 of any new funding to transit. The greatest variation here was among the business workshop participants, 32 percent of whom would devote 3/4 of new funding to roads, and about a quarter splitting funds evenly and another quarter spending 3/4 on transit.
- Thirty-two percent of participants want new funds split evenly between work and non-work trips, followed by 27 percent who would lean in favor of 3/4 for work trips. However, workshop participants in low-income communities disagreed somewhat, with 26 percent saying all new funds should be concentrated on non-work trips.

Participant's responses to the above question can be found in Appendix B, Pages B-11 and B-12.

Specifically, how would you propose spending any NEW funding that is available?
--

Workshop Results

The participants' top responses, in order of frequency, were:

- Expand train services/add trains
- Expand bicycle and pedestrian facilities
- Maintain and replace street and highway pavement
- Expand express and local buses/add buses
- Provide more transit service to low-income neighborhoods

Differences Among Workshops

Overall, the business groups ranked *pavement maintenance* as their top priority for new spending, *widening freeways* as their second priority and *expanding trains* third. Three of the four business workshops ranked *expanding trains* as second priority. Collectively, the low-income groups ranked *more transit to low-income neighborhoods* as their top priority, with *subsidizing transit fares* second and *expanding express and local bus service* as the third priority. Again, there were significant differences among the various workshops.

Participants' responses to the above question can be found in Appendix B, Pages B-13 and B-14.

Web Results

Web participants shared three of the top answers — those regarding more train service, expanding bike and pedestrian facilities, and expanding express and local bus services. However, their other top answers were *maintain and replace transit vehicles and facilities*, and a tie between *provide incentives to people who use transit and ridesharing* and *implement single ticket or fare card good on all systems*.

Most Frequent Comments Related to Investment Choices for New Funding Sources

- ***Bicycle and pedestrian facilities:*** Connect bike lanes together. Design areas with pedestrians and walking in mind. Add new bike lanes.
- ***Carpool lanes:*** Promote lanes more to get them used. Eliminate lanes that are not being used. Connect HOV lanes together. Convert mixed lanes to HOV lanes. Increase the enforcement of carpool lane rules.

- **Water transit:** Add more ferries. Use the Bay for transportation.
- **Roadways:** Build specific projects—East Palo Alto bypass, 238 bypass (Hayward), Caldecott Tunnel 4th bore, Highway 101 widening in Sonoma County, various freeway interchange improvements, etc. Put more funding into maintenance of roads and streets. Improve safety of roads. Build more roads because people want to drive and need to drive.
- **Paratransit:** Expand paratransit services. Make services more user-friendly. Use accessible taxis and other “creative” approaches.
- **Transit:** Emphasize new projects that are cost-effective (low cost/rider). Produce good connections between buses, trains, cars, bikes, etc. Directly connect services like BART at Fremont and Santa Clara light rail. Expand fast transit like trains and express buses. Initiate or improve bus services in specific areas that are lightly served. Run services to reflect the 24/7 world people live in.
- **General:** Consider the movement of goods, not just people, when making investments. Fix what we have before we spend money on new projects. Expedite and coordinate the permitting process for projects. Prioritize cost-effective projects. Focus on many smaller projects rather a few big ones that require large funding.
- **Transit fares:** Do not raise transit fares, but experiment with varying fares, discounts,

Voices from the Workshops and the Web

- *BART should run all night. No excuses. Public transit should be free. Transit saves money in the larger picture; it should not have to "pay for itself" directly.*
- *I think the solution is train (BART and Caltrain) and shuttles. If folks know they can get to and from their workplace after they leave the train, this would relieve a lot of the traffic on the 101 corridor.*
- *Maintain the roadway system in excellent condition for when we need to drive and for the benefit of transit vehicles, but give the region's residents excellent alternatives to always having to use private vehicles.*
- *We need more bike-friendly roads—wide right lanes, bike lanes, bike access to cross over freeways and bridges.*
- *We need longer transit operating hours to accommodate seniors and others who depend on transit.*
- *Promotion, support, and reinstitution of public school transportation would alleviate traffic activity.*

Voices from the Workshops and the Web [continued]

- *Transit agencies need to work together and not compete against one another.*
- *My local bus service doesn't operate at all on Sundays!*
- *Need more paratransit services and much better coordination between those services in my county.*
- *Difficulty exiting and reentering the Bay Area on weekends. All major routes in and out are "bottlenecked" (101 south thru Coyote Valley; I-580 east through Tracy; I-80/I-680 Northeast through Fairfield; 101 North thru Santa Rosa.)*
- *Add a Super Shuttle service between places like BART and CSU Hayward.*
- *Develop a good congestion management plan for Chinatown. Delivery trucks, many pedestrians, crowded buses, narrow streets and sidewalks, all competing for space.*

MANAGING POLLUTION AND ENERGY CONSUMPTION

Although the cost of traffic congestion and need for improved and additional transit are the usual focal points of investment discussions, other issues are at stake. Beyond whether we can move goods and people, we must explore the implications of our choices.

What should we do to reduce transportation-related air, water and noise pollution and to decrease energy consumption?

Workshop Results

The top responses in order of frequency were:

- Ensure that new housing and office developments promote and enhance transit use
- Expand public transit
- Accelerate the shift to low-emission vehicles
- Provide more bicycle/pedestrian facilities
- Provide more financial/other incentives to take transit
- Increase vehicle fuel efficiency

Differences Among Workshops

There were only minor variations between how the business groups and the low-income groups responded to this question. Business groups ranked *increase vehicle fuel efficiency* second, while the low-income groups ranked it sixth. The low-income groups placed higher priority on *providing more incentives to take transit*, ranking it third, while the business community ranked it seventh. Nearly every workshop ranked as first or second *ensuring that new housing and office development promote and enhance transit*.

Participants' responses to the above question can be found in Appendix B, Pages B-15 and B-16.

Web Results

On the Web, participants shared some of the top preferences — *expanding public transit*, *more low-emission vehicles*, *expanding bicycle and pedestrian facilities* and *increasing fuel efficiency*. They also liked the idea of *reducing high-speed driving*, *increasing the cost of driving* and *encouraging “trip chaining” to reduce personal trips*.

Most Frequent Comments Related to Managing Pollution and Energy Consumption

- Must consider air pollution impacts when choosing to build roads or BART and bus.
- Relieve congestion to reduce pollution. Idling cars far more polluting.
- Reduce automobile use improve air, water, toxics.
- Provide more incentives for people to use low-emissions vehicles.
- Decrease energy consumption through non-highway transit (trains, ferries) and bikes.
- Need long-term planning to really reduce automobile use.

Voices from the Workshops and the Web

- *Buy-back old, polluting cars and have them destroyed*
- *New developments (both housing and commercial) should be built along major commercial streets, creating transit-oriented facilities.*
- *A public mass-transit system that provides connections a person can access easily and all day long will, in the end, solve this problem. Focusing on short-term environmental goals will prevent us from ever developing this true system.*
- *Increasing tolls on high smog days would discourage people from driving and raise additional funds.*
- *I favor grocery stores, child care, adult education facilities, etc. near transit hubs.*
- *Create greater "gas-guzzler" taxes and other fees for wasteful and polluting vehicles.*
- *Encourage bicycling by making it safer and more convenient. Safety is the big issue.*
- *Reduce congestion because cars sitting in traffic pollute 8 times more than those that are moving.*
- *Publish a Hall of Fame for commuter-savvy employers and consider a Hall of Shame too!*

ACCOMMODATING GROWTH

There is no question that the Bay Area will continue to grow, with forecasters predicting a million more people in this region over the next 20 years — a jump of 15 percent. The implications for the transportation system are clear: it will need to accommodate many more demands to get from Point A to Point B. How the transportation system handles this challenge is a key question for the 2001 RTP.

Do you agree or disagree with these ideas to accommodate this population growth?

Workshop Results

About 90 percent of participants responded that they strongly supported or somewhat supported the following (75 percent said they strongly supported these):

- Fund incentives for more mixed-income housing and other compact development near transit lines
- Revitalize and build more new housing in central Bay Area cities and older suburbs rather than in new suburbs and areas on the edge of the region
- Build new housing and other development along existing transit lines in central cities and older suburbs and along new transit lines in new suburbs

About 60 percent of participants responded that they strongly opposed or somewhat opposed building more new housing in suburbs and areas on the edge of the region and then expanding freeways and transit service to serve these areas.

Differences Among Workshops

Both the business groups and the low-income groups showed very strong support for the first three strategies listed above (*incentives, central Bay Area revitalization and building along transit lines*).

Participants' responses to the above question can be found in Appendix B, Pages B-17 and B-18.

Web Results

Web participants also supported the ideas of concentrating new housing and jobs along existing and new transit lines, providing more housing and jobs in central Bay Area cities and established suburbs, and focusing funding for freeway and transit to serve these areas. Their support was, however, somewhat lower, just under 50 percent.

Most Frequent Comments Related to Accommodating Growth

- Land use planning must consider mobility.
- MTC should use its power over transportation funding as a “carrot” to promote local land use and transportation coordination.
- Support efforts—VTA in Santa Clara, Pleasant Hill BART development, City of Hayward and others—to coordinate land use with transportation.
- Design neighborhoods, commercial districts and employment centers to make walking and biking easy.
- Focus housing and office development at transit stations and along transit lines.
- Use financial incentives to make the development market work for transportation.
- Infill central Bay Area communities that have transit services already.

Voices from the Workshops and the Web

- *State, Federal, and Regional transit dollars should be awarded to communities that permit higher density and withheld from those that don't.*
- *Overhaul zoning laws. Zoning laws typically separate work and residence areas; there should be incentives to plan multi-use areas. Zoning laws also typically require minimal parking facilities (e.g. 1 space per residential unit). Use offsets — no parking required if located within 1/4 mile from rapid transit.*
- *Land use choices determine transportation system efficiencies. Wasteful land use leads to a bad transportation system.*
- *Kill the urban growth boundary fad. We're just pushing our problems North, East and South.*
- *It is impractical to provide more housing in the central Bay Area given the high price of land. Subsidized, central core housing is a good idea but probably cannot be accomplished for 1 million new people.*
- *Any new transit lines should be funded only if the land uses along the lines will encourage transit ridership and discourage automobile use.*
- *Combine decision making authority of land use and transportation into one body or provide/require transportation decision makers to comment and permit land use decisions.*

Voices from the Workshops and the Web [continued]

- *Don't use transportation funding to provide housing incentives.*
- *MTC should be looking at not just the next 1 million people, but the next 10 million.*
- *Builders want to do infill housing in the cities, but can't find sites. We need incentives. There needs to be a dual approach, infill and suburban development.*

BUILDING A LIFELINE TRANSIT SYSTEM

Bay Area county social service agencies and community-based organizations have teamed with MTC to develop a range of strategies to meet the needs of low-income individuals to get to jobs, school, child care and other essential destinations. One of the key ideas to come from these efforts is the definition and development of a “lifeline transit network” that would provide a certain level of basic services to those who need it most: transit-dependent and families at the bottom of the wage scale. But what is a transit lifeline? Is the primary focus getting to work, or is getting to other destinations just as great a need, or greater?

What are the most vital lifeline services?

Workshop Results

The top responses in order of frequency were:

- Improved transit services to work
- Improved transit services to school
- Lower transit fares for low-income individuals

Differences Among Workshops

The low-income groups ranked *transit services to school* first priority, *transit services to work* second, *lower transit fares* third and *transit to medical services* fourth. The business groups ranked *transit services to work* first and *transit services to school* second, followed by *transit to government services* and *lower fares*.

Participants’ responses to the above question can be found in Appendix B, Pages B-19 and B-20.

Web Results

Answers from Web participants were very close, except that 15 percent of those voting on the Web also thought *lowering transit fares for low-income individuals* was fairly important, ranking it third on the list.

What would be the best way to fund lifeline services?

Workshop Results

- More than 90 percent of workshop participants responded that they strongly supported or somewhat supported improving overall efficiency to free up transit operating funds, as well as seeking new funding sources for transit operations.
- More than 60 percent said that they strongly supported or somewhat supported the option of seeking greater ability to transfer funds from road expansion projects to lifeline transit services.
- About half of participants said that they strongly supported or somewhat supported seeking greater ability to transfer funds from transit capital expansion projects to lifeline transit services.
- More than 65 percent strongly opposed or somewhat opposed reducing commute-period transit services to free up transit operating funds for lifeline services, decreasing funding for transit maintenance to free up transit operating funds for lifeline services, or increasing transit fares.

Differences Among Workshops

The low-income groups and business groups had similar positions on *reducing commute period services* (opposed), *improving transit efficiency* (supported) and *decreasing maintenance funding* (opposed). They disagreed on *transferring funds from capital transit and road projects* (low-income supported, business opposed) and on *seeking new funding sources for transit operations* (low-income supported, business mixed).

Participants' responses to the above question can be found in Appendix B, Pages B-21 and B-22.

Most Frequent Comments Related to Building a Lifeline Transit System

- People without cars need much better service to health facilities, child care and other essentials.
- The senior population will grow tremendously during the next 20 years and services must be improved.
- 24 hour transit is required for many individuals who are entering the job force or are trying to hold better jobs.
- Look at creative ways to provide lifeline services with public and private transportation resources that are currently under-used. (Car sharing, vans, incentives to small-scale providers, etc.)

Voices from the Workshops and the Web

- *It is not an option to have transit to work, but not be able to shop easily or recreate, etc. All of these are needs, which must be met.*
- *Alternatives to auto transport are tentative and inadequate, as though they are afraid to take on the real need.*
- *The public-transit "system" is too discontinuous, both physically and in ownership. Transfers between providers are arbitrarily expensive, and often poorly scheduled.*
- *The biggest problem that I have is although I live close to public transit, the system is so incredibly slow. To go greater than 30 miles it takes an hour and a half.*
- *Find new sources of funding for transportation subsidies for low-income individuals. This money should not have to come from transportation agencies.*
- *Transportation is a civil rights issue. African-Americans are still sitting in the "back of the bus." When you help the poor, you help everyone. Everyone should be attracted to public transit.*

IMPROVING ACCESS FOR FREIGHT AND AIRPORT/SEAPORTS

A healthy economy depends on efficient movement of people and goods. Birthplace of the new economy and home to a variety of old-economy businesses, the Bay Area is also a significant water, rail and highway hub for shipping and a major hub for small-package delivery services — not to mention that we attract more than 17 million tourists a year! As these businesses grow, they, too, will place increased demands on the transportation system.

Do you agree or disagree with these specific strategies to improve freight operation and airport/seaport access?

Workshop Results

- More than 60 percent of participants said that they strongly supported or somewhat supported placing a higher priority on transportation improvements that will make it easier for trucks to move about the region.
- More than 80 percent of participants strongly supported or somewhat supported placing a higher priority on ground transportation improvements that serve airports and seaports.

Differences Among Workshops

Both business and low-income groups supported *improvements for trucking*. Business support was somewhat higher. Business and low-income groups also supported *airport/seaport access improvements*; again, however, business support was somewhat higher.

Participants' responses to the above question can be found in Appendix B, Pages B-23 and B-24.

Web Results

Although 59 percent of Web participants strongly supported or somewhat supported increasing the priority for ground transportation improvements, only 37 percent expressed such support for improvements to make it easier for trucks to get around.

What are the most effective strategies for enhancing goods movement in the region?

Workshop Results

The top responses in order of frequency were:

- Shift more containerized truck cargo to rail
- Make it easier for cargo pickup and delivery through stronger parking regulations and loading zone enforcement
- Provide new dedicated lanes for trucks on freeways and major streets (possibly with tolls)

Differences Among Workshops

Both business and low-income groups supported the number one priority, *shifting cargo to rail*. Business groups did not support the second priority, *parking enforcement*, while low-income groups supported it strongly. Both groups supported the third priority, *new dedicated lanes for trucks*.

Participants' responses to the above question can be found in Appendix B, Pages B-25 and B-26.

Web Results

Web participants echoed the workshop participants voting on this issue.

Most Frequent Comments Related to Improving Access for Freight and Airport/Seaports

- Improving transit should help goods movement by reducing congestion.
- Need a better, integrated, regional plan for goods movement looking at roads, water transit, rail, ports, etc.
- Employers of all types are being negatively affected by having their employees stuck in congestion and traveling long distances to work.
- Truck travel in the region has multiple impacts on transportation—parking, downtown congestion, automobile safety, etc—that must be considered.

Voices from the Workshops and the Web

- *A special single-width, reversible toll lane could be built for areas like the Altamont and Sunol grades. Trucks would be required to use it (like the Grapevine near Los Angeles) during commute times.*
- *Stop wasting billions of dollars on airport connection boondoggles. Most of us do not travel to the airport every day; we instead are stuck waiting and waiting and waiting for the 22 bus (or the 51 bus, or the 391 bus, or whatever) to arrive.*
- *This is simple -- convert existing parking to yellow loading zones so trucks have a place to make deliveries. Have \$500 fines for people who park in loading zones.*
- *Improve rail and road access to the Port of Oakland and road access to the airports — including possibly dedicated truck lanes.*
- *Provide more incentives for trucking and movement during off-peak hours and/or stricter tolls during peak hours. Enforce restrictions on double-parking.*
- *We must improve the infrastructure serving ports, air terminals and rail yards.*

EXPLORING VALUES

At 10 selected workshops — including the initial RTP Kick-off Workshop on February 27, 2000 — participants had a chance to think about and discuss their underlying values concerning investment decisions about transportation. Equity, environmental protection, the livability and viability of neighborhoods and districts, a healthy economy and efficient movement of goods and people: All of these values are important. But are they equally important, or are some more critical than others?

The answer, at least according to workshop participants, is that they are equally important. Asked to break into groups of three people and then come to consensus within those small groups about how to distribute priority for these values, the final tally came to between 20 and 23 percent for each, except for economic health, which ranked last with 14.8 percent allocated to it.

Participants' responses to the above question can be found in Appendix B, Pages B-27 and B-28.

4. COMPARISON OF WORKSHOPS/WEB SURVEY AND TELEPHONE POLL

In addition to the workshops and Web survey, MTC conducted a separate regional telephone poll that probed some of the same transportation issues. The three participation methods had distinct differences in purpose, target audiences and actual questions.

The 14-question telephone poll obtained the opinions of a 1,600-person sample of registered voters in the nine-county Bay Area. The 29 workshops solicited more detailed input from specific targeted groups — low-income communities, business groups, the disabled community, seniors, etc. — and a wide cross-section of residents from across the region. The Web survey extended the workshops by allowing individuals who could not attend in-person to answer the workshop questions online.

Despite these differences, it is instructive to compare the results, particularly to see where all three groups are in agreement on our transportation problems and potential solutions.

EXPRESSING DISSATISFACTION

All three methods found widespread dissatisfaction with the Bay Area’s transportation system.

Only 37 percent of the telephone poll respondents (registered voters) said they were satisfied with how transportation improvements were being handled. In both the workshops and the Web survey, fewer than 20 percent of participants responded they had a “high” satisfaction level for all six types of trips (work, school, shopping, etc.). Similarly, “low” satisfaction ratings for the six types of trips were in the mid-30 percent to mid-40 percent range in the Web survey and in the 40 percent to 60 percent range in the workshops.

IDENTIFYING KEY CHALLENGES/MOBILITY ISSUES

All three methods found that (a) traffic congestion is the number one issue overall, (b) there are serious problems with public transit (takes too long, does not go where needed, etc.) and (c) traffic makes biking and walking unsafe.

The chart below compares how the three groups ranked the issues in descending order of importance. (The three methods gave somewhat different choices to respondents. See appendices for actual questions.)

Key Challenges to Mobility (in order of importance)			
	Telephone Poll	Workshops	Web Survey
1	Worsening traffic congestion is seriously threatening the quality of life in the Bay Area	There is too much traffic congestion on freeways	There is too much traffic congestion on freeways
2	It is becoming too difficult to drive a car during commute hours in the Bay Area	There is too much traffic congestion on local streets and roads	Transit takes too long
3	Bicycling to work is not practical for people like myself	Transit takes too long	Transit does not go where I need to go
4	Public transportation does not go where I need to go	Transit does not go where I need to go	It is too hard/dangerous to get around on a bike
5	Public transportation takes too long	It is too hard/dangerous to get around on a bike	There is too much traffic congestion on local streets and roads
6	It is too difficult to find someone to carpool with who fits my schedule	Transit does not run when I need to travel	Transit does not run when I need to travel
7	Traffic makes it unsafe to walk or bicycle	Traffic makes it unsafe and/or unfriendly to walk	Traffic makes it unsafe and/or unfriendly to walk
8	It is becoming too expensive to own and operate a car in the Bay Area	Transit is unreliable	The carpool lane system is not continuous. The lanes stop and start
9	Public transportation is not scheduled conveniently when I need to travel.	Transit is too expensive	My job is too far from my home
10	Public transportation is too expensive	The carpool lane system is not continuous. The lanes stop and start	Transit is too expensive
11	Information on public transportation schedules is too difficult to get	I cannot afford to purchase/maintain a car.	It is too hard to get information on traffic conditions and transit
12		My job is too far from my home	I cannot find anyone to carpool with who fits my schedule and route
13		It is too difficult to find someone to carpool with who fits my schedule	I cannot afford to purchase/maintain a car
14		It is too hard to get information on traffic conditions and transit	

CALLING FOR IMPROVEMENTS

All three methods found strong support for expanding BART or rail services. Maintaining streets and roads, expanding bus services and a single ticket fare card scored well in the results of all three methods with some differences between them. Buses scored somewhat lower in the telephone poll of registered voters, while maintaining streets and highways scored lower on the Web. The single ticket fare card scored somewhat lower in the workshops.

The chart below compares how the three groups ranked their high priority improvements in descending order of importance. (The three methods gave somewhat different choices to respondents.)

Improvements Needed (in order of importance)			
	Telephone Poll	Workshops	Web Survey
1	Expand BART	Expand rail	Expand rail
2	Maintain streets and highways	Expand bike/walk facilities	Expand buses
3	Single ticket fare card	Maintain streets and highways	Maintain transit vehicles/facilities
4	Expand signal timing	Expand buses	Expand bike/walk facilities
5	Expand rail	Expand transit to low-income communities	Incentives for transit and ridesharing
6	Expand express buses	Widen freeways	Single ticket fare card
7	Expand local buses	Maintain transit vehicles/facilities	Maintain streets and highways
8	Widen freeways	Single-ticket fare card	Expand Transportation for Livable Communities program
9	Expand ferries	Incentives for transit and ridesharing	Expand ferries
10	Expand ramp metering	Subsidize transit fares for low-income individuals	Widen freeways
11	Expand traveler information	Expand Transportation for Livable Communities program	Expand signal timing
12	Expand carpool lanes	Expand signal timing	Expand transit to low-income communities
13	Expand bike lanes	Expand ferries	Subsidize fares for low-income
14		Expand Housing Incentive Program	Expand Housing Incentive Program

ACCOMMODATING GROWTH

All three methods supported the same two top strategies for accommodating growth in the region over the next 20 years. In all three outreach mechanisms, these strategies were supported:

1. Build housing along BART and transit lines.
2. Build new housing and transportation in developed areas (central cities/older suburbs).

IMPROVING FREIGHT AND AIRPORT/SEAPORT ACCESS

All three methods found support for (a) shifting truck cargo to rail or ferry, (b) dedicated lanes for trucks on freeways and (c) encouraging more night deliveries instead of day goods movement. (The latter was not directly asked in the Web and workshop surveys, but received very strong support in the write-in comments.) The telephone poll gave more support than the Web/workshop surveys to letting small trucks “buy into” the carpool lanes. Different phrasing on truck parking questions made comparisons between the telephone poll and the other two methods difficult.

TRAVELING BY BIKE

The telephone poll found that improving safety would have the biggest effect on increasing bike travel. Forty percent of those polled said they would ride a bike to work if bike lanes were safer and traffic was less hazardous. Fewer respondents said they would bike if their employer had showers (32 percent) or if more bike lanes were built (25 percent). While these exact questions were not asked in the workshops or Web survey, *it is too hard/dangerous to get around on a bike* was ranked the number five challenge overall in both the Web survey and the workshops.

SUPPORTING NEW FUNDING SOURCES

All three methods found majority support for three measures to increase transportation funding — a half-cent sales tax, higher vehicle registrations and new state transportation bonds. In addition, the Web survey gave majority support to higher bridge tolls while the workshops and telephone poll were split about 50-50.

The polls were also split on raising property taxes (telephone poll, 50 percent support; workshops, 23 percent; Web, 23 percent) although this difference is probably explained by the telephone poll specifying a \$25 per year (relatively small) increase while the Web and workshops gave no dollar amount. The polls were split on support for the gas tax increase (Web, 68 percent; workshops, 60 percent; and telephone poll, 23 percent).

All three methods overwhelmingly opposed raising transit fares to fund new transportation improvements.

FUNDING TRANSIT OPERATIONS

All three methods found majority support for (a) shifting some funding from roads to transit operations, and, (b) shifting some funding from transit capital expenditures to transit operations. All three methods also found overwhelming opposition to reducing commute transit services to fund more non-commute period transit. The telephone poll gave slight majority support to raising transit fares to fund more transit operations, while the workshops and Web survey were overwhelmingly opposed.

5. METHODOLOGY

The RTP Public Outreach and Involvement Program has sought to produce results through high-quality input and participation, diversity, education, reach, accessibility, impact and participant satisfaction. Furthermore, the program was intended to:

- Involve individuals and groups who have not been significantly involved in transportation planning and induce them to participate not only in the development of the RTP but also in long-term planning processes;
- Increase the involvement of people living in low-income and minority communities and ensure that the voices of these communities, often underrepresented in public planning programs, are heard;
- Complement the simultaneous process of the county congestion management agencies to develop lists of projects they are submitting for inclusion in the RTP; and
- Add input and information obtained from the telephone poll commissioned by MTC.

Outreach activities were designed to educate people as well as solicit their opinions. The educational element was intended to inform participants about the implications involved in adopting the plan: What are the issues that must be considered in planning the transportation system? What effects will the different choices have on us as individuals and as a region?

At the same time, the involvement portion was designed to make it easy for participants to express their priorities and preferences, both in terms of values, actual projects and programs.

REACHING OUT IN PHASE I

Four types of activities were used in Phase I: Public and Targeted Workshops; a Complementary Involvement Process on MTC's Website; a Regional Telephone Poll; and Media Outreach to support these efforts.

Public and Targeted Workshops

Initial Workshop: The Public Outreach Program began with a two-hour "kick-off" workshop on February 27 to educate stakeholders and the public about the RTP update process. The workshop consisted of a "walkaround" exercise followed by an interactive discussion period.

During the hour-long "walkaround," attendees had the opportunity to visit eight areas or "stations" with graphic displays depicting important transportation issues to be integrated into the forthcoming RTP. The stations addressed general topics related to transportation such as mobility,

land use and funding mechanisms. Participants were asked to respond to various questions related to each topic and to provide written comments. For example, Station 5: Environment, posed 15 possibilities for reducing pollution and decreasing energy consumption, and attendees were asked to pick their “top” five preferences, as well as to leave behind written comments before proceeding to the next station.

During the discussion period, two activities took place. First, participants were asked to work in groups of three for a 10-minute period. Each group was provided with a Trio Exercise Card containing a list of five transportation value statements corresponding to the five broad RTP goals: equity; environmental protection; the livability and viability of neighborhoods and districts; a healthy economy; and efficient movement of goods and people. During the exercise, each group of three was instructed to assign 100 points among the five values by reaching consensus as a group about the relative importance of each value.

Second, in a large group discussion participants reviewed the results of the “walkaround” on a station-by-station basis and provided additional comments.

Targeted Workshops: In April and May, workshops targeted at specific communities and interests (such as business groups, low-income communities or seniors) were used to generate participation from a range of special interests, ethnic groups, socioeconomic groups, geography and other characteristics throughout the region. The workshops sought to involve individuals and organizations that have previously not participated in the RTP planning process. A total of 29 workshops were held, with more than 700 attendees.

These workshops were similar to the February 27 kickoff. MTC — assisted by the public outreach consultants — identified potential partners, and then contacted the targeted groups to get commitments for hosting a workshop. In some cases, MTC provided funding to community groups to help conduct the workshops. Translation in Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese and Lao was made available and assistance for participants with disabilities was provided as needed.

The consultant team, following the two-part “walkaround” and group discussion format described previously for the kickoff, facilitated most workshops. The consultants also produced a workshop “toolkit” so that MTC staff or community leaders could facilitate the workshops themselves. The kit included comment sheets for participants, an agenda, a discussion framework, results feedback forms (for the facilitators to complete), and handouts and presentation materials that included easy-to-use poster versions of the large display boards used at the kick-off and other workshops.

Results from the workshops were recorded in two ways. Participants’ votes on the various issues presented in the display boards and posters were recorded in spreadsheets, which could then tally vote totals and calculate percentages and rankings. The consultant team also created an Access database to record all comments provided at the workshops.

The following table identifies the sponsoring organization/agency, the location and the date for each public and targeted workshop that was held in conjunction with Phase I of the Regional Transportation Plan Public Outreach and Involvement Program:

Sponsor	City	Date
Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Oakland	2/27/01
Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Oakland	3/19/01
Contra Costa Transportation Authority	Walnut Creek	3/21/01
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee	San Pablo	3/22/01
Contra Costa Transportation Authority	Antioch	3/29/01
California Alliance for Jobs & Port of Oakland	Oakland	4/5/01
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency	Pleasanton	4/10/01
Solano County Congestion Management Agency	Suisun	4/11/01
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency	Hayward	4/12/01
Santa Clara County Social Services Agency	San Jose	4/17/01
Contra Costa County Social Services Agency	Antioch	4/18/01
San Mateo County Congestion Management Agency	San Carlos	4/18/01
MTC Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee	Oakland	4/19/01
California Alliance for Jobs & North Coast Builders Exchange	Santa Rosa	4/23/01
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency	Oakland	4/24/01
Alameda County Congestion Management Agency	Union City	4/25/01
Sonoma County Transportation Authority	Santa Rosa	4/30/01
League of Women Voters, San Jose/Santa Clara Chapter	East San Jose	5/2/01
Economic Development Alliance for Business	Hayward	5/4/01
One East Palo Alto Neighborhood Initiative	East Palo Alto	5/7/01
Neighborhood House of North Richmond	North Richmond	5/8/01
California State Automobile Association	San Francisco	5/9/01

Sponsor	City	Date
United Neighborhood Association of Santa Clara County	San Jose	5/10/01
City of San Rafael	San Rafael	5/10/01
Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group	Palo Alto	5/14/01
East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation	Oakland	5/15/01
Continental of Omega Boys and Girls Club Federation of Latin American Descendents Filipino-American Social Services Vallejo Intertribal Council	Vallejo	5/16/01
Chinatown Community Development Agency	San Francisco	5/18/01
Bay View Hunters Point Community Advocates	San Francisco	5/19/01
Contra Costa Labor and Environmental Movements Collaboration	Martinez	5/22/01

Web Survey

Although workshops were held throughout the region, many people could not attend a workshop in person. For those with access to the Internet, MTC staff created a “virtual tour” of the workshop “walkaround.” The questions were similar, and participants could vote as well as provide comments. The site generated much interest in April and May and many good comments. More than 1,700 people participated and more than 2,200 comments were received. Votes were recorded automatically.

Media Outreach

A media outreach campaign was designed to support the workshops and Web survey. Specifically, media relations were conducted to generate attendance at targeted workshops when appropriate, to educate citizens about the RTP and choices involved, and to solicit comments and opinions from citizens about how they would like discretionary funds to be spent. Media outreach was broken into two categories: general public outreach and low-income/minority outreach.

For general outreach, MTC and the consultants conducted four activities:

- ***Workshop announcements*** — News releases and flyers announcing local workshops were distributed through the media.
- ***Talk show bookings*** — A list of television and radio talk shows was compiled, and several stations were contacted for talk-show bookings. An MTC staff person and a consultant also

made a presentation to the Bay Area Public Affairs Directors organization, which resulted in subsequent media coverage of the workshops and the RTP.

- **Video distribution** — MTC staff arranged for taping of the kick-off event, and worked with the consultant team to distribute an edited video to 25 cable stations and systems.
- **Media briefing** — MTC also conducted a briefing for the news media, which served to generate media interest in the early stages of the RTP development.

Activities targeting minority/low-income communities were focused on generating attendance at the workshops. They included:

- **Flyer distribution** — Flyers were designed to publicize each workshop (translations in Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese and Lao were available). The team also researched community-based organizations, churches, municipal or neighborhood communications media to receive the flyers.
- **Identifying partnerships with minority media** — Discussions were held with KTSF, a multilingual TV station, about ways to partner with them on the outreach program. (Such a partnership required more bilingual resources than MTC had available, but will be pursued for future opportunities.)
- **Outreach to community leaders** — MTC and the consultant team worked with community leaders to publicize the workshops in local areas.

Telephone Opinion Poll

To complement the workshops and Web survey, MTC staff and a survey research firm designed and conducted a regional telephone poll of 1,600 registered voters on key RTP issues in April and May. The results of the poll are included in Appendix C, and a discussion of the similarities and differences between the poll and workshops is contained in Chapter 4.

MEASURING PERFORMANCE

In order to evaluate the quality of input and participation, diversity, education, reach, accessibility, impact, and participant satisfaction generated through the Public Outreach Program, MTC and its consultant team developed performance objectives. Except where indicated by an asterisk (*), measures are true measurements of outputs and outcomes, rather than inputs or efforts.

Accessibility

- Meetings are held in all nine counties.
- One hundred percent of meeting locations are accessible by transit.*
- Meetings are linguistically accessible to 100 percent of participants, with three working days' advance request for translation.* (Meeting announcements will offer translation services with

M E T H O D O L O G Y

advance notice to participants speaking any language with available professional translation services.)

- All meetings are accessible under the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).*

Reach

- Two thousand or more written comments are logged into the Comment Tracking and Response System.
- At least 1,800 individuals actively participate in the RTP Outreach and Involvement Program, as measured by survey responses and meeting attendance (excluding repeat attendance).
- There are 800 to 1,000 visits to or “views” of the RTP section of the MTC website during active periods of the public outreach and involvement program (February through May and August through November).
- The RTP update or elements of it are mentioned in at least 30 newspaper articles or other printed media.
- MTC participates in at least 20 radio or television broadcasts during the RTP Update process.
- The RTP Update is mentioned in 5 op/ed pieces.

Diversity

- The demographics of targeted workshop groups (age, ethnicity, income, geographic location, disability) roughly mirrors the demographics of the Bay Area’s population.*
- Seventy percent of targeted organizations and groups participate in at least one RTP Update meeting.
- Participants represent a cross-section of people of various interests, places of residence and primary modes of travel, as reported on evaluation forms distributed at meetings.

Impact

- One hundred percent of written comments received are logged into the Comment Tracking and Response System, analyzed, summarized and communicated in time for consideration by staff or Commissioners.
- One hundred percent of the written comments are acknowledged so that the person making them knows whether his or her comment is reflected in the outcome of a Commission action, or, conversely, why the Commission acted differently.

Participant Satisfaction

Sixty percent of RTP participants rate the RTP Outreach Program as *excellent, good or fair* on each of the following performance dimensions (or other specific features to be determined):

- Accessibility (meeting locations, materials presented in appropriate languages for targeted audiences, with sufficient advance notice, etc.)
- Adequate notice
- Sufficient opportunity to comment
- Clear understanding of items that are established policy versus those that are open to public influence
- Clear information at an appropriate level of detail
- Educational value of presentations and materials
- Responsiveness to comments received
- Understanding of other perspectives and differing priorities
- Quality of the discussion

Once the RTP is adopted, MTC will evaluate how its public involvement program measured up to each of these goals. Results will be used to inform and improve subsequent outreach and involvement activities.

6. NEXT STEPS

Phase II of the Public Outreach and Involvement Program will commence after the Draft RTP and EIR are released in mid-August 2001. Phase II will include a second round of public involvement. The final RTP and EIR will be adopted by the Commission in November 2001.